

REMARKS

In the Office Action of Nov. 24, 2008, claims 1, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected. With this paper, claims 1, 4-13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 28 are amended, claims 14, 15, 22, 24, 25 and 27 are canceled and none are added. The application now includes claims 1, 4-13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 28.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office rejected claims based on the following grounds:

1. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-25 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lunsford et al. (U.S. Patent 6,901,434, Lunsford hereinafter) in view of Doi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,978,919, Doi hereinafter).

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lunsford in view of Doi and further in view of Hepper et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0220966).

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lunsford in view of Doi and further in view of Oh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,865,400).

In the rejected claims, claims 1, 17, 22 and 28 are independent. Claim 22 is now canceled.

Regarding the independent claims 1, 17 and 28, the Office acknowledged that Lunsford does not teach a command to automatically switch off the first mobile terminal device after completion of synchronization, but asserts that this feature can be found in Doi.

With this paper, independent claims 1, 17 and 28 are amended to add that a user interface menu is activated on the apparatus (first mobile device) in response to a first user input, the user interface menu comprises a plurality of both non-synchronization and synchronization related operation modes of the apparatus (first mobile device), and one operation mode from the plurality of operation modes is selected in response to a second user input. Therefore, if the selected operation mode contains a command to perform an automated synchronization with another apparatus (second mobile device), the synchronization is performed given that the other apparatus (second mobile device) is

available.

Support for the amendment can be found on page 12, line 29 to page 13, line 16 and Fig. 2 of the originally filed application.

Lunsford teaches that the handheld computer 100 has a touch screen display 120 that allows a user to request a synchronization by dragging and clicking a user-interactive feature (icon, menu item) (see col. 3, lines 17-25 of Lunsford). Applicant respectfully submits that such a user input (request) is not the same as the first and the second user input in the present invention. In the present invention, the first user input activates a user interface menu, and the second user input selects a menu item, which corresponds to an operation mode of the first mobile device. The selection itself does not necessarily result in a request for synchronization. As disclosed on page 11, lines 11-16 and Fig. 2 of the originally filed application, each operation mode (such as silent, meet, outdoor, etc.) contains a set of profile that defines the behavior of the first mobile device. Only if the selected operation mode comprises a command to synchronize with a second mobile device, the first mobile device would be configured to check the availability of the second mobile device and synchronize with the second mobile device. Therefore, Lunsford does not teach “activating a user interface menu on a first mobile device in response to a first user input, said user interface menu comprising a plurality of operation modes,” and “receiving a second user input for selecting one operation mode from the plurality of operation modes.”

Other references Doi, Hepper et al. and Oh et al. also do not disclose the above features related to operation modes.

Based on the above and in view of the amendment, Applicant respectfully requests the above rejections of the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims in the instant application are allowable, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent

urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/5/2009
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Customer No.: 004955



Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885